

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Quavis Page, #327815,) C/A No. 4:14-4341-RBH
)
Plaintiff,)
) ORDER
vs.)
)
Warden Dennis Bush; Ass. Warden Willie Davis; Capt.)	
Thomas Commander; DHO Capt. Sharron Patterson;)	
SMU Classification Mrs. Vanderhaul,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

This case is before the Court because of Plaintiff's failure to comply with the magistrate judge's Order of January 26, 2015, and March 11, 2015. ECF No. 6, 14

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge ordered Plaintiff to submit items needed to render this case into proper form within twenty-one days, and specifically informed Plaintiff that if he failed to do so, this case would be subject to dismissal. The Court has not received any response from Plaintiff and the time for his compliance has passed.

The mail in which the Order was sent to Plaintiff at the address provided when the case was filed has not been returned to the court, thus it is presumed that Plaintiff received the Order, but has neglected to comply with it within the time permitted under the Order.

Plaintiff's lack of response to the Order indicates an intent to not prosecute this case, and subjects this case to dismissal. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)(district courts may dismiss an action if a Plaintiff fails to comply with an order of the court.); see also Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989)(dismissal with prejudice appropriate where warning given); Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982)(court may dismiss sua sponte).

Accordingly, this case is dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

May 26, 2015
Florence, SC

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within the time period set forth under Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.